UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/539,891	06/17/2005	Johnathan A Napier	13478-00001-US	7537
	7590 09/21/200 BOVE LODGE & HUT	EXAMINER		
PO BOX 2207		ZHENG, LI		
WILMINGTON, DE 19899			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
		1638		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/21/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/539,891	NAPIER ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	

	LI ZHENG	1638	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appear	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>18 August 2009</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS AF	PPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	ALLOWANCE.	
1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following rapplication in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apple for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	eplies: (1) an amendment, affidavit al (with appeal fee) in compliance v	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of this Ac no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f)	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth inter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing on ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE (b).	g date of the final rejectio FIRST REPLY WAS FIL	n. .ED WITHIN TWO
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extender 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the slipset forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount on the content of the corresponding amount of the	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	te extension fee e action; or (2) as
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compl filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exten Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with AMENDMENTS	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b  (a) They raise new issues that would require further con  (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below  (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or  (d) They present additional claims without canceling a c	sideration and/or search (see NOT v); er form for appeal by materially red	E below); ducing or simplifying th	
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).  4.  The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12  5.  Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):  6.  Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowed non-allowable claim(s).  7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov	bwable if submitted in a separate, t  will not be entered, or b) ⊠ will	imely filed amendmer	t canceling the
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:  Claim(s) allowed:  Claim(s) objected to:  Claim(s) rejected: 1,2,7-9 and 26.  Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:  AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to over showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary</li> </ol>	/ercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea and was not earlier presented. Se	ıl and/or appellant fails ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1)	s to provide a
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER		•	
<ol> <li>The request for reconsideration has been considered but <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u></li> </ol>		condition for allowand	ce because:
<ul><li>12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (l</li><li>13. ☐ Other:</li></ul>	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
/Anne Marie Grunberg/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1638			

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Claims 1-2, 7-9 and 26 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for a method for accumulate C16, C18 and C20 polyunsaturated fatty acids in transgenic plant expressing nucleotide sequences encoding SEQ ID NO: 2,4 and 6, does not reasonably provide enablement for a transgenic plant to produce any compound shown in formula I of claim 1 with a content of at least 1% by weight. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to practice the invention commensurate in scope with these claims, for the reasons of record stated in the Office action mailed April 28, 2009. Applicants traverse in the paper filed August 18, 2009. Applicants' arguments have been fully considered but were not found persuasive.

Applicants argue the current amendment narrows the scope encompassed by the formula I of claim 1 (response, page 6, last paragraph).

The Office contends that the working example in the specification only shows the data for the content of C16, C18 and C20 polyunsaturated fatty acids such as the ones listed in table 1, it still does not provide any evidence that other compounds in the formula I of claim 1 are produced by the instant method. There is still no evidence that the transgenically expressed enzymes would produce such unmanageable number of compounds as depicted in claim 1.